LFC Requester:	Eric Chenier

AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS 2016 REGULAR SESSION

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, EMAIL ANALYSIS TO:

LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV

and

DFA@STATE.NM.US

{Include the bill no. in the email subject line, e.g., HB2, and only attach one bill analysis and related documentation per email message}

Check all that apply:		Date 2/3/2016		
Original X Amendment		Bill No : SB 278		
Correctio	on Substitute			
ponsor:	Jacob Candelaria	Agency Code: 305		
hort	Drug & IV Medical Necessity	Person Writing Patricia Padrino Tucker		
itle: Appeals		Phone: 505-222-9082 Email ptucker@nmag.g	Email ptucker@nmag.gov	

Appropriation		Recurring	Fund	
FY16	FY17	or Nonrecurring	Affected	

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring	Fund
FY16	FY17	FY18	or Nonrecurring	Affected

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY16	FY17	FY18	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to: Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

This analysis is neither a formal Attorney General's Opinion nor an Attorney General's Advisory Letter. This is a staff analysis in response to an agency's, committee's, or legislator's request.

Synopsis:

SB 278 amends the Health Maintenance Organization Act, Section 59A-46-2, NMSA 1978, to include a definition of "adverse determination of medical necessity." SB 278 also includes new material allowing for an immediate external appeal to the Superintendent of Insurance of an adverse determination of medical necessity relating to coverage for prescription drugs.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

No fiscal impact for the Office of the Attorney General.

However, SB 278 will have a fiscal impact on the Office of Superintendent of Insurance because the bill will require the superintendent or appointed hearing officer of the superintendent to review any adverse determination of medical necessity relating to coverage for a prescription drug if requested by an enrollee under the Health Maintenance Organization Act. These additional hearings will require additional resources and time investment from the Office of Superintendent of Insurance.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

SB 278 calls for review of the record and preparation of findings of fact, conclusions of law and a recommendation by the superintendent, at page 9, lines 2-5. This subsection proceeds to allow the superintendent or hearing officer to review and dissent from its own decision, at page 9, lines 5-7. It is unclear if this process contemplates two separate stages with separate reviews.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

N/A

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

N/A

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

None.
TECHNICAL ISSUES

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

SB 278 calls for a "recommendation regarding a finding of medical necessity from a health care provider who: 1) has not previously reviewed the matter under review; and 2) is of the same or a similar specialty as the health care provider who would typically manage the medical or dental condition, procedure or treatment for which the prescription drug under review in the appeal was prescribed." It is unclear who will be responsible for payment to this health care provider.

There may also be some confusion with regard to timelines. While it appears there is a specific timeline for both the insurance carrier and the Office of Superintendent of Insurance, the only guidance for the enrollee is language allowing a request "immediately upon receipt of…an adverse determination." It is unclear when an enrollee would lose his or her right to make such a request.

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

N/A

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

Status quo.

AMENDMENTS

None.